12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

26

27

28

LAURA PETERS,

2	_	
R C	S	
ш	Z	
NB	O	
>	I	
	- 9	

1	D. Lee Roberts, Jr., Esq.
2	lroberts@wwhgd.com
	Nevada Bar No. 8877
3	Ryan T. Gormley, Esq.
	<u>rgormley@wwhgd.com</u>
4	Nevada Bar No. 13494
	Jonathan J. Winn, Esq.
5	jwinn@wwhgd.com
	Nevada Bar No. 12896
6	WEINBERG, WHEELER, HUDGINS,
١	GUNN & DIAL, LLC
7	6385 South Rainbow Blvd., Suite 400
	Las Vegas, Nevada 89118
8	Telephone: (702) 938-3838
	Facsimile: (702) 938-3864
9	Attorneys for Defendant
	Swift Transportation Co. of Arizona, LLO
10 l	Swiji Transportation Co. oj Artzona, LLC

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

v. **SWIFT TRANSPORTATION** CO. OF ARIZONA, LLC; DOE DRIVER; DOES I through XX, inclusive; and ROE BUSINESS ENTITIES I through XX, inclusive,

Plaintiff,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:19-cv-00874-GMN-EJY

STIPULATION AND ORDER TO EXTEND DISCOVERY DEADLINES

(ELEVENTH REQUEST)

Defendant Swift Transportation Co. of Arizona, LLC ("Swift") and Plaintiff Laura Peters ("Ms. Peters" or "Plaintiff"), by and through their respective undersigned counsel, hereby stipulate and agree to extend the current discovery deadlines set forth in the Scheduling Order entered on January 20, 2022 (ECF No. 68) pursuant to LR 26-3. This is the eleventh stipulation to extend the discovery deadlines.

///

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

27

28

Statement Specifying the Discovery Completed A.

To date, the parties have completed significant written discovery. Plaintiff has disclosed forty-two supplements to her Rule 26(a) initial disclosures, identifying over 50 witnesses and thousands of pages of records. Plaintiff has also responded and provided supplemental responses to two sets of requests for production and two sets of interrogatories. Swift has also disclosed over a thousand pages of records and subpoenaed records from dozens of medical providers. The parties have also served and responded to Rule 34 vehicle inspection requests. Further, three medical examinations of Ms. Peters arranged by Swift have taken place.

As for experts, the parties have disclosed initial and rebuttal experts. Plaintiff identified nine medical professionals as non-retained medical expert/treating physicians. Plaintiff further identified ten initial experts, in the areas of accident reconstruction/biomechanical, spinal surgery, orthopedics, economics, radiology, neuropsychology, neurology, addiction, life care planning, and occupational therapy. Swift has identified nine experts, in the areas of spinal surgery, orthopedics, neurology, life care planning, psychiatry, accident reconstruction/biomechanical, economics, neuropsychology, and neuroradiology.¹

As for depositions, Swift deposed Plaintiff on March 9, 2021; eight fact witnesses (Cipra Dominitz on April 23, 2021, Kemba Kessee on April 27, 2021, Jessalyn Pitz on April 30, 2021 and May 25, 2021, Heather Swonick on May 4, 2021, Spencer Peters on May 11, 2021, Julie Chapin on June 25, 2021, Kelli Thornton on January 5, 2022, and Kevin Thornton on January 5, 2022); five treating providers (Richard Tull, EMT on April 23, 2021, Raymond Mathieson, PA-C, on May 11, 2021, Dr. Jaswinder Grover on June 10, 2021 and March 10, 2022, Dr. Xin Nick Liu on June 14, 2021, Dr. Abiog on March 1, 2022, and Dr. Catapano on March 17, 2022); and six experts (Dr. Clauretie on January 27, 2022, Dr. Fazzini on February 16, 2022, Dr. Bashcaron on February 18, 2022, Dr. Hirschfeld on February 28, 2022, Dr. Loong on March 8, 2022, and Dr. Garber on

²⁶

¹ The descriptions of the parties' experts' areas of expertise is for information purposes only, and in no way is intended or should be construed as defining or otherwise limiting the scope or expertise of said experts.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

26

27

28

March 10, 2022). Plaintiff has deposed four expert witnesses (Dr. Fontes on January 13, 2022, Dr. Mills on January 14, 2022, Dr. Funk on January 20, 2022, and Dr. Tamm on February 7, 2022).

В. **Specific Description of the Discovery that Remains to be Completed**

Discovery in this case has been ongoing and additional discovery remains to be completed, including, but not limited to:

- Written Discovery. The parties are meeting and conferring over past responses and Swift will continue to evaluate the need for additional requests or subpoenas depending on how discovery progresses, particularly since Ms. Peters is still undergoing treatment.
- Experts. The parties intend to disclose additional supplements as necessary and are evaluating options as a result of the passing of one of Plaintiff's experts.
- Depositions. Swift intends to take a number of depositions in this matter, including, but not limited to, pertinent fact witnesses, additional non-retained medical expert/treating physicians, and experts disclosed by Plaintiff. Plaintiff also intends to take a number of depositions, including, but not limited to, pertinent fact witnesses, several medical providers, and experts disclosed by Swift. Given the number of witnesses, the parties anticipate the need to take more than ten depositions. A more detailed summary is below.
- All other discovery deemed necessary by the parties in accordance with the scheduling order and permitted by law.

C. Reasons Why Discovery was not Completed

Since the last discovery extension, the parties have progressed in discovery, primarily taking depositions and providing expert supplements. While several depositions were taken in February, certain depositions had to be rescheduled due to both emergency issues and pending supplemental reports. Unfortunately, several depositions remain to be taken and specific expert work remains to be done related to the ongoing treatment, the untimely passing of an expert, and surgical complications from Plaintiff's last surgery. Trial conflicts and scheduling issues, however, have complicated the matter. For instance, trial started on March 14, 2022 in the conflicting matter for Defense counsel previously mentioned in the last stipulation, Eskew v. Sierra Health and Life Insurance Company, Inc., and is expected to last several weeks until approximately April 6th. Likewise, Plaintiff has a trial with a firm start date of April 18, 2022, Amy Wilson v. Las Vegas Party Coach, et al., which is anticipated to proceed to trial and last until May 31-June 1, 2022. In light of these significant conflicts over March, April, and May, the parties request a 90-day extension so that these depositions and expert work can be completed through March, April, May, and June.

The following depositions are scheduled: Ms. Xitco (3/23); Dr. Linetsky (3/24); Dr. Snyder (4/11). For the remaining deponents, the parties are conferring on witness availability and scheduling for April and May, including for Dr. Montesano (rescheduled), Dr. Croft (rescheduled), Mr. Lamoreaux (rescheduled), Bonnie Clear, Valerie Tucker, con't of Ms. Peters, Mr. Wach, Dr. Al-Hawarey, Dr. Lewis, Dr. Badday, and Dr. Ghuman.

The parties recognize that given the age of this matter that this is a significant extension and understand the need and urgency to complete discovery in this matter and appreciate the Court's indulgence and they will continue to work in good faith to complete discovery.

///

17 ///

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1

4 5

7 8

6

9

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

20

19

21

23

22

24

2526

27

28

D. Proposed Schedule for Completing Remaining Discovery

Event	Current Deadline (ECF No. 68)	Proposed Deadline
Discovery Cutoff	03/28/2022	06/28/2022
Deadline Amend Pleadings/Add Parties	Passed	Passed
Initial Expert Disclosure	Passed	Passed
Rebuttal Expert Disclosure	Passed	Passed
Dispositive Motions	04/28/2022	07/28/2022
Pretrial Order	30 days after the dispositive motion deadline unless dispositive motions are pending, in which case, the deadline would be 60 days after the order on the dispositive motion(s) is issued.	

If dispositive motions are filed, the deadline for filing the pretrial order will be suspended until 30 days after decision on the dipositive motions or further court order. The disclosures required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(3) and any objections to them must be included in the pretrial order.

DATED: March 18, 2022

/s/ Ryan T. Gormley

D. Lee Roberts, Jr., Esq. Ryan T. Gormley, Esq.

WEINBERG, WHEELER, HUDGINS,

GUNN & DIAL, LLC

6385 South Rainbow Blvd., Suite 400

Las Vegas, Nevada 89118 Attorneys for Defendant

Swift Transportation Co. of Arizona, LLC

DATED: March 18, 2022

/s/ Ramzy Paul Ladah (with permission)

Ramzy Paul Ladah, Esq. LADAH LAW FIRM, PLLC 517 S. Third Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Attorneys for Plaintiff

Laura Peters

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: March 18, 2022

JNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE